

Page 4994

1 CLECs raise on the weekly calls, the line-loss
2 report?
3 A. [SEARS] The line-loss report is out of
4 scope.
5 Q. Out of scope. And what does "out of scope"
6 mean?
7 A. [SEARS] There's nothing in the master test
8 plan that talks about testing the line-loss report.
9 We didn't do any testing of the line-loss report.
10 Q. So did KPMG only follow the parameters of
11 the master test plan?
12 A. [SEARS] In most instances I would say that
13 we did follow the parameters of the master test
14 plan.
15 Q. And what's the purpose of that?
16 A. [SEARS] The master test plan was agreed
17 upon by the Massachusetts DTE, with a lot of input
18 from our parties, to represent the scope of the
19 test, and the line-loss report was not part of the
20 test.
21 Q. Who would direct KPMG to expand the scope of
22 its testing beyond the master test plan?
23 A. [SEARS] There's two ways that that could
24 happen. Well, there's three ways that that could

Page 4995

1 happen. You could communicate with the DTE, the
2 CLEC community -- or Bell Atlantic could. We could
3 go back to the DTE and advise them we thought that
4 the master test plan needed --
5 We could go back and advise the DTE that
6 we thought there were deficiencies in the master
7 test plan. And the DTE could come to conclusions
8 without any input as to if there were things that
9 needed to be changed, enhanced, or subtracted from
10 the master test plan. So there's at least three
11 ways that I can think of.
12 Q. After your test plan was released, did the
13 DTE direct you to expand the scope of your tests in
14 any way?
15 A. [SEARS] On at least one, if not more than
16 one, occasion, we were directed, not asked, to
17 expand the scope of our test, yes.
18 Q. In what way?
19 A. [SEARS] The original MTP didn't have a
20 volume test in it. We were asked to expand it with
21 regard to DSL. Carrier-to-carrier metrics was a
22 change to the master test plan. And there was a
23 directive to do a regression or functionality test
24 in LSOG 4. So those are four large areas that I can

Page 4996

1 think of where we changed the master test plan and
2 there were substantial changes to our testing
3 efforts.
4 Q. Were there any areas where KPMG went to the
5 Department and recommended --
6 CHAIRMAN CONNELLY: I think you're
7 getting into advice between us and our contractor
8 here. You can ask your question, but --
9 MS. SCARDINO: I'd just like to
10 understand whether or not -- what was deleted the
11 master test plan, what was expanded, and Mr. Sears
12 just testified as to what --
13 CHAIRMAN CONNELLY: Why don't you just
14 ask your question, then.
15 MS. SCARDINO: May I restate my
16 question?
17 CHAIRMAN CONNELLY: Surely. Go ahead.
18 Q. Were there any instances where KPMG
19 recommended to the Department that the test plan be
20 expanded in any way?
21 A. [SEARS] There's at least one that I can
22 think of.
23 Q. And what would that be?
24 A. [SEARS] I think we recommended to the

Page 4997

1 Department that they consider an LSOG 4
2 functionality test.
3 Q. And was that considered?
4 A. [SEARS] Yes. It was inserted into the
5 master test plan.
6 Q. I'd like to follow up, then, on one of the
7 questions -- one of the areas that was revealed on
8 error codes. As we stated earlier, I recall that in
9 the New York tests there were inconsistencies
10 between Bell Atlantic's error codes and the
11 documentation, and it was not satisfied and then
12 satisfied with qualifications.
13 But you had testified earlier that KPMG
14 only used the remarks field in looking at the error
15 codes, or largely used the remarks field, and didn't
16 use the actual error code itself; is that correct?
17 A. [SEARS] There are two different issues
18 here, and I'm sure that I've confused everybody.
19 One of them has to do with SEMs, and one of them has
20 to do with errors in preorders, and they're, I
21 believe, very different. Is that correct? I'd like
22 Nicole to answer this one, because she's the one
23 that did the test.
24 A. [GIUGNO] I think what you're referring to

Page 4998

1 is our discussion on LSOG 4 GUI order responses,
2 some of which were missing an error code. In the
3 cases where we were missing error codes, we used the
4 remarks field description to analyze the errors and
5 submit subsequent responses -- subsequent
6 transactions. We were not -- we were able to do so
7 successfully.
8 In LSOG 2 we did not consistently find
9 error codes missing. When error codes were
10 returned, we did do a review of the error codes
11 returned versus document to error codes, and we did
12 not find any problem relative to that.
13 A. [SEARS] So the answer is we had the problem
14 with the error codes in LSOG 4; we didn't have it
15 with LSOG 2.
16 A. [GIUGNO] LSOG 2 GUI.
17 Q. And you didn't have it with LSOG 4 EDI.
18 A. [GIUGNO] No.
19 Q. On the other LSOG -- let's focus on LSOG 4,
20 EDI, and LSOG 2. You were able to rely on the
21 actual error code without looking at the remarks?
22 A. [GIUGNO] No, we used the remarks to provide
23 the level of information that we need to understand
24 the error and submit the subsequent response.

Page 4999

1 A. [BOWERS] We actually used both.
2 A. [GIUGNO] We did look at the error codes.
3 Q. That's what I'm trying to focus on. Why do
4 you need to use the remarks, rather than actually
5 looking at the actual error code itself?
6 A. [BOWERS] The fields are right next to each
7 other, and so you look at both. It's through some
8 analysis of looking at the error-code description
9 and looking at the remarks field where you determine
10 what's wrong with that order. So they're really
11 inseparable in your analysis.
12 Q. And then I believe that someone had
13 testified that a lot of it depends on the experience
14 of the individual looking at the remarks, that if
15 they had seen a remark before they would be able to
16 appropriately diagnose the problem again. Is that
17 correct?
18 A. [GIUGNO] It would be easier for them, yes.
19 Q. Are the remarks that are included in the
20 remarks field something that Bell Atlantic includes
21 in its documentation?
22 A. [GIUGNO] Yes.
23 Q. So why is it, then, dependent on the
24 experience of the rep processing the order, that's

Page 5000

1 stated in the documentation?
2 A. [GIUGNO] There were a couple of cases where
3 the remarks, which were present both in the error
4 response and in the documentation, the same
5 remark -- we were unable to understand that remark
6 well enough to correct our error. In those cases we
7 called the help desk.
8 Q. In those instances did you make Bell
9 Atlantic aware of those instances, where the remarks
10 were not easy to interpret?
11 A. [GIUGNO] Through the help-desk process,
12 yes.
13 Q. To the best of your knowledge, has Bell
14 Atlantic followed up its documentation to account
15 for the fact that the remarks aren't easily
16 understood?
17 A. [GIUGNO] To my knowledge, no.
18 A. [BOWERS] I'm not aware of any changes
19 they've made to those remarks.
20 I want to clarify: On the remarks
21 system there are standard system-generated remarks
22 that we get back, and there are also remarks that
23 reps physically type in in that field as well. What
24 we're referring to here is system-generated standard

Page 5001

1 error remarks.
2 Q. So you don't know if Bell Atlantic did, or
3 did you test it and it wasn't there?
4 A. [SEARS] We don't know.
5 Q. Do you know if the help desk keeps track of
6 things such as this, where a CLEC would call and
7 say, "I don't understand what this remark is," and
8 the help desk relays the information? Does the help
9 desk keep track of these kinds of things?
10 A. [GIUGNO] I don't know that.
11 A. [SEARS] Can we ask one of the people that's
12 not here and get you a response to that, please?
13 Q. Sure.
14 A. [SEARS] We did a help-desk evaluation, and
15 again, I want to make sure that we don't give you a
16 false answer.
17 Q. This is another followup: I believe there
18 was a question about when there was DSL testing,
19 that there was at least one example where there were
20 no facilities available. And Mr. DellaTorre I
21 believe testified that this issue has been resolved.
22 I wanted to understand what that meant.
23 A. [DELLATORRE] Well, first, I will defer to
24 Steve. I don't think that it was me that said that.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5002</p> <p>1 A. [SEARS] It's 45 DSL orders. Four of those 2 orders were held for facilities availability. And 3 we did do loop qualifications on those four orders 4 that were held for facilities availability. 5 Q. I guess I'm not sure what was meant when 6 someone stated that the issue was resolved. Does 7 that mean that the four, eventually facilities were 8 found or -- 9 A. [SEARS] I honestly don't know who made that 10 comment. It's unlikely to have been me. 11 I don't know that the issue is resolved 12 fundamentally. In the time interval between when 13 you do you a loop qualification and when a circuit 14 is provisioned, it's possible for facilities to not 15 be available or for facilities that were available 16 to become unavailable. So it's not unexpected that 17 this happens; let's put it that way. 18 Q. So you tested 45 live stand-alone ADSL -- 19 A. [SEARS] We actually used 45 CLEC 20 transactions. 21 Q. One CLEC or multiple CLECs? 22 A. [SESKO] Multiple CLECs. 23 Q. And you observed the actual CLEC from the 24 preorder transaction all the way through</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5004</p> <p>1 information from Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts on 2 the actual flow-through and non-flow-through status 3 for all LSRs submitted. My question is, did KPMG 4 request this information from Bell Atlantic? 5 A. [GIUGNO] Yes, we did. 6 Q. And why wasn't it provided? 7 A. [GIUGNO] I couldn't answer that. Bell 8 Atlantic did provide actual flow-through or 9 non-flow-through indicators for the majority of our 10 PONs, but not for 100 percent of them. 11 Q. The report goes on to state that in the 12 absence of actual flow-through information KPMG 13 utilized expected flow-through and non-flow-through 14 indicators. My question is: Based on what 15 documentation or representation did KPMG make these 16 assumptions? 17 A. [GIUGNO] We used the publicly available 18 Bell Atlantic documentation. 19 Q. Which is availability on their Web site? 20 A. [GIUGNO] Correct. 21 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes. 22 Q. Were any xDSL loop orders used in the POP 1 23 test evaluation? 24 A. [BOWERS] Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5003</p> <p>1 provisioning? 2 A. [SESKO] Well, no, we sent our observers out 3 with Bell Atlantic technicians during the 4 installation of the ADSL orders, and they observed 5 the entire installation process. 6 A. [SEARS] So we did not observe the actual 7 loop qualification transaction occurring. We were 8 relying on representation from the CLECs that those 9 loop quals were done. 10 Q. So there are 45 orders. Four there are no 11 facilities available. Were the other 41 provisioned 12 on time, within the six-day interval? 13 A. [SESKO] Yes, the other 41 were provisioned 14 on time on the due date requested by the CLEC. 15 Q. Then we can turn to my prefiled questions. 16 First on the POP 1 domain: In Footnotes 20, 21, 22, 17 and 23, KPMG states that it did not receive 18 information from Bell Atlantic on the actual flow- 19 through and non-flow-through status of all LSRs 20 submitted. Did KPMG request this information from 21 Bell Atlantic? It's on Page 48. 22 A. [GIUGNO] Could you repeat the question? 23 Q. Sure. It's Question 1. Footnotes 20, 21, 24 22, and 23 state that KPMG did not receive</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5005</p> <p>1 Q. And are they included in the UNE-L result? 2 A. [BOWERS] Yes, they are. 3 Q. Do you have any specific results for the 4 flow-through rate of the ADSL loops? 5 A. [SEARS] We did not disaggregate our results 6 to that level. 7 Q. Is there a reason why you didn't? 8 A. [SEARS] We just didn't. 9 Q. Going to POP 3. Some of these relate to 10 flow-through, and I don't know if these fall in the 11 same category as Ms. Johnson's questions, that I 12 believe you said the appropriate person wasn't here. 13 In Table 3-7, which is on Page 122, KPMG 14 lists that it received 1367 unexpected flow-through 15 results because orders were sent during SOP 16 downtime. What are the scheduled hours for SOP 17 downtime in Massachusetts? 18 A. [SEARS] Midnight to 7:00 a.m., Monday 19 through Friday. 20 Q. And were these transactions submitted during 21 these hours? 22 A. [SEARS] Yes. These were run during our 23 volume tests. 24 Q. So they were intentionally submitted when</p>

1 SOP was down?
2 A. [SEARS] Yes. We ran a lot of transactions
3 between midnight and 7:00 a.m.
4 Q. Are you aware that after the New York 271
5 evaluation that Bell Atlantic changed their SOP
6 hours, their SOP downtime hours in New York?
7 A. [SEARS] No.
8 Q. They reduced it? You're not aware of that?
9 A. [SEARS] No, I'm not aware that they reduced
10 it in New York. We know it's shrinking in some
11 jurisdictions.
12 A. [BOWERS] We're aware they recently changed
13 SOP downtime hours in Massachusetts, after this
14 particular test was --
15 Q. So what is the SOP downtime now in
16 Massachusetts?
17 A. [DELLATORRE] I think it's one hour.
18 A. [BOWERS] It's one hour. It's, I would say,
19 11:30 p.m. to 12:30 a.m. I'd have to check on that.
20 A. [SEARS] The answer is, we're sure that it's
21 shorter.
22 Q. Ms. Johnson had asked a similar question to
23 my No. 4, which is identify the four scenarios
24 referenced in Section 3.3, the flow-through parity

1 A. [SEARS] We did not do on-site observations.
2 We did do interviews and help-desk interactions were
3 subjects of those interviews. But we did not go on
4 site and physically observe those interactions.
5 A. [DELLATORRE] Can I provide a piece of
6 clarifying information? There are certain hunting
7 scenario types that will in fact flow through -- for
8 example, a migration as is.
9 Q. But the four scenarios, was it two types of
10 hunting that didn't flow through?
11 A. [SEARS] Three of the scenarios are hunting
12 scenarios, one of them is a Ringmate scenario. And
13 I think that all Joe is trying to clarify is not all
14 hunting scenarios do not flow through, only certain
15 types of hunting scenarios do not flow through,
16 partial migration I believe being the one that
17 doesn't flow through.
18 Q. Back to the question I just asked. You
19 stated that you did not go on site to the CLECs,
20 observe live interaction between the CLEC and the
21 help desk. Is there a particular reason why you did
22 not do that? I believe you did that in New York.
23 A. [SEARS] The answer is that we believe that
24 the interview process that we conducted was an

1 results, where the orders were flow-through-eligible
2 for retail but not wholesale. I believe you said
3 that they related to Ringmate and hunting.
4 A. [SEARS] That's correct.
5 Q. When did you perform this test where this
6 was revealed? Do you know the date?
7 A. [DELLATORRE] During our transaction tests.
8 Sometime in May, I would believe. I think May.
9 Q. So to the best of your knowledge, at this
10 time, would you agree that hunting and Ringmate,
11 based on your tests, do not flow through for
12 wholesale?
13 A. [BOWERS] Yes.
14 Q. Turning to the POP 5 test, which is the
15 help-desk test. When KPMG contacted the help desk,
16 I believe in your report it states that you had one
17 representative designated to deal with the help
18 desk. Did that representative identify him- or
19 herself as being from KPMG?
20 A. [SEARS] Yes.
21 Q. Did KPMG observe any of Bell Atlantic's help
22 desks by going on site to particular CLECs and
23 observing the interaction between the CLEC and the
24 help desk?

1 effective substitute for going on site.
2 Q. And in the interview process are the results
3 of those interviews that you had with CLECs in this
4 report?
5 A. [SEARS] The notes are not in the report,
6 certainly.
7 Q. Can you highlight the feedback you received
8 from the CLECs about their experience in dealing
9 with the help desk?
10 A. [SEARS] The gentleman who did those
11 interviews is actually on his way here, so it's
12 something I'd be happy to clarify at some later
13 point.
14 Q. I'd be interested in getting that
15 information.
16 In POP 5-7, which is on Page 163, KPMG
17 notes that troubleshooting frequently required
18 multiple calls between Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts
19 and KPMG. Can you explain why that is?
20 A. [DELLATORRE] KPMG has found that
21 problem-solving, particularly in transaction
22 submission, is an iterative process, because often
23 not all of the problems are uncovered in the first
24 submission of an order. So while the first problem

Page 5010

1 may be encountered, and therefore a help-desk ticket
2 opened, a subsequent submission of that same
3 transaction may reveal a second and third error on
4 the order and require multiple phone calls.
5 Q. In instances where the CLEC might have all
6 the information he or she needs to explain a
7 particular problem, when calling the help desk
8 usually issues could be resolved in one call?
9 A. [DELLATORRE] There's some percentage of
10 calls are absolutely answered on the very first
11 call. I shouldn't speculate. I think it's in the
12 60 percent range.
13 A. [SEARS] I'm not sure we're answering your
14 question.
15 Q. My question is: I'd like to get your
16 opinion as to how the number of callbacks could be
17 reduced between the CLEC and the help desk, meaning
18 that the CLEC could make one call and have the issue
19 resolved.
20 A. [SEARS] I'm guessing that other than saying
21 the obvious, which is the higher the quality of the
22 initial software release, the less number of calls
23 there have to be at all -- fundamentally, as Joe
24 explained, the problem is that problems mask other

Page 5011

1 problems. So you may think jointly you've isolated
2 the problem, you try to reexecute the transaction,
3 the field that you isolated as your problem cause is
4 now working, and some other field isn't working.
5 Iterative problem-solving is very
6 common. I think the only way to reduce the number
7 of calls is to reduce the absolute number of
8 problems that you have to deal with with the help
9 desk. I think when you have a problem it's always
10 going to be an iterative problem-solving situation,
11 and it's really independent of the amount of
12 information that I have and the amount of
13 information that Bell Atlantic has, because it's not
14 until I change the way I actually attempt to process
15 the transaction that I find out whether or not what
16 I thought was going to work actually worked. And
17 not only that, actually sometimes -- in fact, it's
18 often negative, because if you change two variables
19 at the same time, and the transaction still doesn't
20 work, you don't know what you fixed and what you
21 broke again. So I think it's just fundamental, when
22 you have issues, you've got to change a single
23 variable at a time until you get the problem fixed.
24 Q. A complaint that I know Rhythms has had, and

Page 5012

1 I've heard other CLECs testify to it in prior weeks,
2 is their first contact with the help desk doesn't
3 always resolve the problem, that they're often
4 passed to another group after the initial contact
5 with the help desk, and that the first contact is
6 almost like someone that's a message-taker
7 documenting the problem. My question is: Did KPMG
8 also identify this problem, where the first contact
9 with the help desk was not a representative that
10 could respond to the question?
11 A. [SEARS] What Joe is whispering in my ear
12 over here is that our understanding is that their
13 process is designed to actually not -- is almost
14 designed to be a clearinghouse environment and that
15 it's designed to point you at the appropriate
16 subject matter expert, which would facilitate some
17 sort of soft or hard handoff to that subject matter
18 expert. Our understanding is -- these are complex
19 issues -- it would be very difficult to have a help
20 desk to address a lot of these issues on the first
21 call in.
22 Q. This is a nice segue into my next question,
23 which is: In POP 5-19, which Ms. Johnson had asked
24 a question about, KPMG notes that their performance

Page 5013

1 of help-desk responsibilities in the TISOC is not
2 evaluated or tracked, because this would be one of
3 those groups that the initial intaker takes the call
4 and refers it to the subject matter expert, which in
5 this instance would be the TISOC.
6 I'm wondering, then, is it just the
7 first contact with the help desk, is it just that
8 first tier that Bell Atlantic has the tracking and
9 evaluation criteria set forth, that you had
10 reviewed?
11 WITNESS SEARS: Can you read that back?
12 Q. I don't think that was clear. Let me
13 explain. There's this first level where the CLEC
14 contacts, which is called the help desk, which you
15 stated as a clearinghouse. Is that the group that
16 has the evaluation and tracking procedures?
17 A. [SEARS] That is one of the groups that does
18 track help-desk responsiveness and timeliness, yes.
19 Q. Are there any other groups behind that first
20 level that do have the same evaluation and tracking
21 criteria?
22 A. [SEARS] If you're asking, for example, does
23 the TISOC have established guidelines to resolve
24 errors?

1 Q. Yes.

2 A. [SEARS] I don't know. We'll take a look
3 and see if we do know. I think the answer is no,
4 but I'm not sure.

5 A. [DELLATORRE] Actually, in evaluation
6 criteria POP 5-23 we address the evaluation
7 criteria. The process includes clear procedures for
8 tracking performance, addressing errors, escalating
9 problems, and resolving exceptions. It goes on to
10 explain what the TISOC does, and it says that errors
11 are addressed in the MNP documents used by
12 representatives in each center.

13 A. [SEARS] But it also says there is no
14 measure of time to resolve an issue in the TISOC.
15 So I think the answer to your question is that when
16 you get to the TISOC there is no defined standard as
17 to how long it should take to resolve an issue.

18 Q. In 5-12, which is my Question 10, KPMG notes
19 that the closing of a TISOC call is not explicitly
20 posted or tracked because the TISOC only deals with
21 PONs. Is there a system or a process in place
22 whereby a CLEC or Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts can
23 determine whether a PON has been queried or
24 confirmed?

1 wholesale and retail orders, with the exception of
2 some specific USOCs related to wholesale products?

3 A. [SESKO] Those USOCs would be for orders
4 that include local number portability or loop hot
5 cuts. The purpose of that is so that a copy of that
6 order would be sent to the RCCC, because it requires
7 coordination.

8 Q. Did KPMG test any of the Bell Atlantic
9 systems that are used to process line-shared orders?

10 A. [SEARS] It's possible that we tested the
11 systems. We did not execute any line-sharing
12 scenarios in our test.

13 Q. Did you evaluate any of the upgrades that
14 Bell Atlantic is planning to implement to. I believe
15 it's 11 systems? They've contracted with Telcordia
16 to upgrade these systems. Did you evaluate any of
17 the proposal to upgrade those systems?

18 A. [SEARS] No.

19 MS. SCARDINO: I have no further
20 questions.

21 MS. CARPINO: Why don't we take a break.
22 (Recess taken.)

23 MS. CARPINO: Let's go back on the
24 record. We're going to have some questions asked by

1 A. [SEARS] It's kind of a direct, you either
2 get a SEM or an LSC. So if your transaction was
3 successful, you get an LSC, and if it was
4 unsuccessful, you get a SEM. But there is no
5 parallel tracking mechanism to the actual feedback
6 you get on your transaction.

7 Q. In POP 6-1-12, which is on Page 191, KPMG
8 notes that the central-office personnel cannot
9 differentiate wholesale orders from retail unless
10 they investigate. Within wholesale orders do you
11 know if a CO technician can distinguish between
12 types of orders, or are they merely assigned orders
13 to perform?

14 A. [SESKO] They're assigned orders based on
15 due date; and yes, if they investigate, they'd be
16 able to tell whether or not it was a CLEC order or a
17 retail order. The order comes on the same sort of
18 job ticket, regardless of whether or not it's a CLEC
19 order or a Bell Atlantic order. So upon
20 presentation of the job ticket, no, they can't
21 differentiate.

22 Q. Turning to Page 197, what are the exceptions
23 for wholesale products referenced in the comment to
24 6-4-7, that SOP does not differentiate between

1 MediaOne of the KPMG witness. Ms. Parker?

2 MS. PARKER: Thank you.

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

4 BY MS. PARKER:

5 Q. Stacey Parker, with AT&T Broadband, formerly
6 MediaOne. With me is Paul Dunphy, the operations
7 manager.

8 We just had a couple of quick questions
9 regarding specifically LNP. MediaOne had identified
10 to KPMG on numerous occasions concerns with the
11 process about the testing of straight LNP, and
12 that's not associated with UNEs or resale, but LNP
13 itself. And we did understand that it would be part
14 of the testing. Could KPMG identify whether
15 actually LNP was tested as part of this process?

16 A. [BOWERS] We included a scenario for number
17 ports both in LSOG 2 and LSOG 4, and we conducted --
18 I don't know the number, but multiple instances of
19 that scenario both in 2 and 4.

20 Q. And could you tell me, identify where in the
21 report the results of those tests are included?

22 A. [BOWERS] There's an indication in Table
23 2-13 that we did it.

24 A. [DELLATORRE] Table 2.13 refers to the LSOG

Page 5018

1 4 functional order test scenarios. It's in the UNE
2 loop category, although the ordering activity
3 specifically says "port a number from BA-MA to
4 CLEC."
5 MR. GRUBER: Could you give us a page on
6 that?
7 A. [SEARS] It's going to be about Page 76.
8 It's Table 2-13. So you'll probably find it on Page
9 75 or 76 in your copy.
10 MR. SALINGER: Page 76.
11 Q. Under "migrate lines from BA-MA with LNP"?
12 A. [SEARS] Yes.
13 A. [BOWERS] It's at the bottom of 2-13, second
14 from the bottom.
15 Q. "Port a number."
16 A. [DELLATORRE] Right.
17 A. [BOWERS] That's the LSOG 4 reference. The
18 LSOG 2 reference is on Table 2-4, second from the
19 bottom.
20 A. [DELLATORRE] It's the same description,
21 port a number from BA-MA to CLEC.
22 Q. Table 2-4?
23 A. [BOWERS] Correct.
24 Q. So even though these are recorded as part

Page 5019

1 of, it looks like UNE loop -- and I don't know what
2 2-4 had -- but they're actually not a function of
3 the UNE loop, it was straight LNP?
4 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.
5 Q. So what were the results of that? Since it
6 wasn't clear to me, reading this report, that the
7 process for LNP was included, could you point out
8 what the results were of those tests?
9 A. [DELLATORRE] Similar to DSL, we did not
10 disaggregate by activity type.
11 A. [BOWERS] The functionality tests proved
12 that we received completions -- confirmations and
13 completions on these orders.
14 Let me correct: We received LSCs or
15 confirmations on these orders, only.
16 Q. So you don't know if you received
17 completions on the orders?
18 A. [SEARS] These orders weren't provisioned.
19 A. [BOWERS] Therefore we didn't get the PCN
20 and the BCN.
21 Q. Can you explain why the orders were not
22 provisioned?
23 A. [SEARS] We could not replicate in our test
24 bed the scenario that would have been required to

Page 5020

1 provision these circuits.
2 Q. Could that have been accomplished with
3 another CLEC replicating the test pattern -- for
4 example, MediaOne?
5 A. [SEARS] Sure.
6 Q. Is there any reason why that didn't occur?
7 A. [SEARS] Not that I know of.
8 A. [DELLATORRE] I'm quite certain we asked for
9 CLEC participation in all of our provisioning
10 activities.
11 Q. And it's my understanding that MediaOne did
12 offer to run those tests for KPMG?
13 A. [SEARS] It's possible that we had a
14 miscommunication. But we clearly would not -- I
15 cannot imagine that we would have declined an offer
16 of cooperation in this test.
17 Q. But the tests were never replicated?
18 A. [SESKO] Not with the CLECs.
19 A. [SEARS] Can you repeat your last question,
20 please?
21 Q. I was confirming that the tests were not
22 actually ever replicated.
23 A. [SEARS] Again, this was a test that was
24 done without provisioning, so we were able to run

Page 5021

1 the tests up to the point of getting the local
2 service confirmation, but there was no provisioning
3 information available.
4 Q. MediaOne also specifically raised a concern
5 about the process having to do with same-day port
6 cancellations or reschedules. Was that scenario
7 ever tested by KPMG?
8 A. [BOWERS] That scenario was not tested.
9 Q. Do you recall that MediaOne identified that
10 specifically -- I think it was as part of the CLEC
11 forums -- as a concern?
12 A. [BOWERS] No recollection.
13 Q. Can you explain a little bit about what the
14 scenario was of the LNP testing, or did you already
15 answer that by saying it was just the order and the
16 confirmation and not the provisioning?
17 A. [BOWERS] It essentially said port a number
18 from BA-MA to CLEC, as stated in tables.
19 Q. Did you test the flow-through scenario for
20 LNP?
21 A. [DELLATORRE] All of our scenarios were
22 subject to the same achieved flow-through
23 expectation.
24 A. [SEARS] Are you asking LNP stand-alone?

1 Q. LNP stand-alone.

2 A. [SEARS] Can we give you an answer on that?
3 Can you give us an evening to take a look? We don't
4 know whether that scenario was actually supposed to
5 flow through or not.

6 Q. Certainly. You stated a minute ago, with
7 reference to LNP under the 2-13 table and 2-4, I
8 believe, that you don't disaggregate the
9 information. I was just wondering if there's any
10 particular reason why.

11 A. [SEARS] There are probably a couple of
12 reasons why. Our reports are essentially done at
13 either the transaction-type or the order-type level.
14 There would certainly be potential statistical
15 issues if we were to try to disaggregate down to the
16 scenario level. So there's a level of aggregation
17 to maintain some sort of level of statistical
18 significance of our results. The second thing is
19 that the MTP, neither the MTP nor the DTE has asked
20 for a disaggregation down to the kind of level that
21 you're talking about asking for. So we didn't do it
22 because we weren't asked.

23 Q. Earlier today we were talking about, I think
24 it's CLEC business-impacting scenarios. In this

1 pools, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 sorts of transactions. But
2 yes, all of our scenarios and all of our data are
3 identified in a way -- not simply -- that we could
4 disaggregate.

5 Q. Well, on the small number of transactions, I
6 assume that in testing that small number that you
7 believe that there was some statistically
8 significant result that you would get by just
9 testing that small of a number: correct?

10 A. [SEARS] No. For example, we might be
11 looking for the presence or absence of
12 functionality, without regard to order type. So no,
13 each of the scenarios is not designed to stand
14 alone. We do not have a report where each of the
15 scenarios is designed -- each of the scenarios is
16 not designed to stand alone. In other words, you
17 can't go in and say, "This scenario is statistically
18 significant." There are plenty of situations --
19 high-caps is a good example -- where even if we used
20 all the CLEC experience during all the months that
21 we tested, we would never get a statistically
22 significant sample of results.

23 Q. On the 45 DSL/ADSL loops that you
24 observed --

1 instance, where the failure of the LNP process would
2 result in a loss of dial tone to a customer, would
3 you agree that that would be a CLEC business-
4 impacting scenario?

5 A. [SEARS] Yes.

6 Q. Subject to the information about the
7 flow-through that you would get back to me on, I
8 think that will do it for my questioning. Thank
9 you.

10 MS. SCARDINO: May I ask a followup?

11 MS. CARPINO: Yes, Ms. Scardino.

12 FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MS. SCARDINO:

14 Q. You testified that DSL and LNP, you did not
15 disaggregate the results in the report. Do you have
16 the underlying data available to support
17 disaggregation if it were requested of you?

18 A. [SEARS] We can identify every scenario, as
19 to what service or product type it's associated
20 with. So given a framework, yes, it would be
21 possible to disaggregate. The concern that I'll
22 reiterate is that when you start getting down to
23 some very small numbers of transactions, it's real
24 unclear what they mean -- if you get into very small

1 A. [SEARS] That's a good sample size.

2 Q. So if requested, you could produce the
3 actual results of each of those transactions?

4 A. [SEARS] It's my belief -- yes, in theory,
5 we could, yes.

6 A. [BOWERS] The 45 you're referring to are
7 actually CLEC orders that we watched being
8 provisioned. If your question is about the KPMG
9 orders that we submitted, it's actually more than
10 that. So we could do that. But I just wanted to
11 clarify what we were talking about.

12 A. [SEARS] So the answer is that in some
13 instances a product or scenario could stand on its
14 own, in some instances it can't.

15 MS. PARKER: May I ask a followup on
16 that?

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. PARKER:

19 Q. So when you stated, for example, LNP as a
20 stand-alone, it could not statistically stand alone,
21 is that because you weren't asked or the master test
22 plan didn't include LNP as a stand-alone test?

23 A. [SEARS] First of all, I don't know how many
24 of the transactions we ran, so I don't know if I

1 would put it in the stand-alone bucket. There's
2 kind of subjective numbers that you say above this
3 number you feel pretty comfortable, below this
4 number you don't. I think it's because actually the
5 tests are designed to produce a report, and the
6 report, for example, was not designed to produce a
7 result that says that UNE -- that LNP stand-alone
8 transactions are --

9 It was not designed to provide a
10 statistical significance on whether or not those
11 transactions work on a stand-alone basis.

12 Q. So even though it was included in the
13 testing, as you pointed out in the report, it was a
14 function of a larger --

15 A. [SEARS] It's more of a hypothesis testing
16 than a statistically significant test. I'm
17 speculating, because I don't know the number of
18 transactions. So if I was talking about xDSL, I
19 would give a different answer than if I were talking
20 about -- I know, for example, I think our DS1
21 numbers are small. Our number of interoffice
22 facilities are small. I don't know what the number
23 of number- portability stand-alone transactions was.

24 Q. Which is my next question: Would it be

1 spring, in concept what KPMG was trying to do was
2 test to a certain total number of both preorder and
3 order transactions and do that by combining the
4 actual commercial transaction levels with additional
5 transactions generated by KPMG in order to reach
6 those volume targets. Is that a fair thumbnail
7 sketch?

8 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.

9 Q. The original master test plan, before it was
10 amended in February of this year, called for volume
11 testing based on the estimated volumes in roughly
12 the middle of the year 2001; correct?

13 A. [SEARS] That's correct.

14 Q. And by letter order dated February 16th, and
15 upon recommendation by KPMG, that target was changed
16 to testing the volumes using a six-month projection
17 out of market activity; correct?

18 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.

19 A. [SEARS] Right.

20 Q. How did KPMG pick October, 2000 as the point
21 in time it was going to project transaction volumes
22 for?

23 A. [SEARS] It was based on our original
24 anticipated report date of May of 2000.

1 possible for you to find out what the number of LPN
2 stand-alone testing situations were?

3 A. [SEARS] Yes.

4 MS. CARPINO: How quickly could you
5 provide that information?

6 A. [SEARS] First thing tomorrow morning.

7 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Salinger?

8 MR. SALINGER: Thank you.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. SALINGER:

11 Q. Let's start by turning to the topic of
12 volume testing. The report indicates, for example,
13 at Pages 5 and 13 that KPMG conducted volume testing
14 in order to project Verizon - Massachusetts's -- or,
15 broadly, Verizon North's -- ability to handle
16 increased CLEC business volumes at estimated
17 October, 2000 levels. These volume tests were
18 conducted for the LSOG 2 systems; correct?

19 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.

20 Q. And my questions are going to focus on the
21 LSOG 2 EDI volume testing that was conducted.

22 When KPMG talks about testing at certain
23 targeted volume levels, as I understand
24 Mr. Dellatorre and others, from conversations last

1 Q. Based upon your original anticipated report
2 date of May, 2000; is that what you said?

3 A. [SEARS] Correct.

4 Q. As things came to pass, the report date was
5 late July of 2000?

6 A. [SEARS] Yes.

7 Q. The volume testing was conducted over a
8 four-day period?

9 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes; not a sequential four
10 days.

11 Q. Which four days?

12 A. [DELLATORRE] I don't have the dates. It's
13 four days within the transaction tests that occurred
14 during May and June.

15 Q. The transaction testing began at the very
16 end of May, and most of it happened in June?

17 A. [DELLATORRE] That's fair, yes.

18 Q. Do you know whether any of the four days of
19 volume testing happened in May or whether all four
20 happened in June?

21 A. [DELLATORRE] No, some were in May and some
22 were June.

23 Q. As of the time that KPMG began its volume
24 testing at the end of May, it's fair to say --

1 indeed. I think it's tautological -- that KPMG knew
2 its report would no longer be issued at the end of
3 May. Yes?

4 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.

5 Q. Why is it that KPMG did not revise its
6 six-month time horizon for estimating volumes to
7 take into account the later-than-anticipated start
8 in the volume testing?

9 A. [SEARS] My recollection is, our forecasts
10 after October actually have the volume levels
11 decreasing.

12 Q. What was the October volume forecast that
13 you tested to?

14 A. [DELLATORRE] I can give you some numbers.

15 A. [SEARS] As a preface, though. The person
16 who ran the volume tests is on vacation today. If
17 we want to go extremely in depth here, I would like
18 to push these questions off until the morning,
19 because the gentleman who actually conducted the
20 tests isn't here right now. We'll attempt to answer
21 your questions, but you may see our knowledge of the
22 details.

23 MR. SALINGER: It may indeed then be
24 more efficient to push those questions off. We

1 last looked at the systems diagrams, which was
2 probably quite a while ago, that there were elements
3 of DCAS still in the North.

4 Q. Is this a topic that KPMG had occasion to
5 discuss with Verizon staff?

6 A. [SEARS] Not to any great level of depth.
7 no. I mean, we have some diagrams up on the walls
8 that show pictures of this. But no, we haven't
9 spent a lot of time on looking at the systems
10 differences between LSOG 4 and LSOG 2, at kind of
11 that very detailed level of systems understanding.

12 Q. Without doing that kind of analysis to
13 understand the differences in systems between LSOG 4
14 and LSOG 2, how could KPMG reach any conclusions
15 about whether separate volume testing for the LSOG 4
16 EDI systems was appropriate?

17 A. [SEARS] It's my understanding that the
18 Massachusetts DTE is going to rely on the LSOG 2
19 volume data. I'm not answering your question. I
20 don't believe KPMG came to that conclusion.

21 Q. Let's just be explicit: Did KPMG undertake
22 any kind of analysis, formal or informal, about
23 whether volume testing of the LSOG 4 EDI systems was
24 appropriate as of June, 2000?

1 certainly have some detailed questions.

2 MS. CARPINO: We can start first thing
3 tomorrow with those questions.

4 Q. I think you confirmed earlier that KPMG did
5 not conduct any volume testing of the LSOG 4
6 systems: correct?

7 A. [SEARS] That's correct.

8 Q. Would it be correct to say that one
9 significant change between the LSOG 2 environment
10 and the LSOG 4 environment is that the latter scraps
11 the old DCAS system and replaces it with a Bell
12 Atlantic South system known as Request Manager?

13 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes, I believe they work in
14 tandem at this point. I believe that there's the
15 expectation that DCAS will be phased out, but at
16 this point DCAS and Request Manager are both in LSOG
17 4.

18 Q. I may be misremembering. That seems to be
19 inconsistent with explanations that Stuart Miller
20 and his OSS panel on behalf of Verizon gave. I'm
21 wondering if you can explain KPMG's basis for
22 understanding that DCAS remains a part of the LSOG 4
23 systems.

24 A. [SEARS] It's my recollection that when I

1 A. [SEARS] I believe there is some preliminary
2 analysis that was cut off when the DTE took the
3 decision to rely on LSOG 2 volume testing.

4 Q. Is it fair to say that there are numerous
5 systems differences between the LSOG 2 EDI systems
6 and the LSOG 4 EDI systems?

7 A. [SEARS] It's fair to say that the front-
8 end interface is different. It's just different.

9 Q. And because of that, is it also fair to say
10 that volume testing results for the LSOG 2 EDI
11 systems may not tell the Department or anyone else
12 much of anything about how the LSOG 4 EDI systems
13 will or will not perform well under volume?

14 A. [SEARS] That's correct.

15 Q. Do you know what the current commercial
16 volumes are on the LSOG 4 systems in EDI?

17 A. [SEARS] I have some information points. My
18 understanding is that AT&T is using LSOG 4 EDI to
19 process transactions in Bell Atlantic North,
20 specifically in New York. I don't have any
21 information at my fingertips as to what those
22 transaction volumes actually are.

23 Q. Is it fair to say that the LSOG 4 EDI
24 systems are being rolled out by Verizon to satisfy

Page 5034

1 its commitment under a settlement agreement that
2 related to its obligation under FCC conditions to
3 supply uniform systems interfaces throughout the old
4 Bell Atlantic region?
5 A. [SEARS] You're exceeding my level of
6 expertise. I don't know how to answer that
7 question. I'm not an attorney.
8 Q. Does any member of the KPMG panel have
9 expertise to answer that?
10 A. [SEARS] I think that's a general impression
11 that my team has, but I'm not a party to that
12 agreement, I haven't read it, and I'm probably not
13 qualified to give an opinion as to whether that's
14 true or not.
15 Q. I'm certainly not asking you for a legal
16 opinion. But my characterization is roughly
17 consistent with your general understanding?
18 A. [SEARS] That's fair, yes.
19 Q. Is it KPMG's general understanding that new
20 CLEC entrants to the Massachusetts local-exchange
21 market that intend to use EDI systems are likely to
22 build to the standard LSOG 4 EDI systems, as opposed
23 to the LSOG 2 systems?
24 A. [SEARS] I don't have any factual

Page 5035

1 information based on feedback from CLECs that leads
2 me to believe one or another.
3 Q. Did KPMG undertake any investigation or
4 analysis of that question?
5 A. [SEARS] We have made inquiries -- I'm
6 trying to formulate this so I don't confuse people.
7 We have asked a variety of CLECs what their entry
8 strategies will be throughout Bell Atlantic during
9 the conduct of trying to construct a volume test for
10 LSOG 4 in another jurisdiction. I don't know if
11 that's relevant to this proceeding, but that's the
12 truth. So we have gone out and talked to
13 yourselves, to MCI, and to other CLECs about their
14 entry strategies across the region with regard to
15 LSOG 2 and LSOG 4.
16 Q. And without revealing any commercial secrets
17 or proprietary information that you learned from
18 individual CLECs, has KPMG formed a general
19 understanding about CLECs' expectation of building
20 to the LSOG 4 EDI systems in the old Bell Atlantic
21 region?
22 A. [SEARS] The feedback that we've gotten is
23 that there will be a variety of entry strategies,
24 some of which are based on LSOG 2 EDI interface.

Page 5036

1 yes.
2 Q. Does KPMG have an understanding as to when
3 the LSOG 2 EDI systems will be retired and no longer
4 supported by Verizon?
5 A. [SEARS] My understanding is no earlier than
6 March of 2001. But I haven't spent a lot of time
7 specifically investigating that issue.
8 Q. In contrast to the question of volume
9 testing of LSOG 4, which we've discussed a little
10 bit, KPMG did perform feature and functionality
11 testing of the LSOG 4 EDI systems?
12 A. [SEARS] Yes, that's correct.
13 Q. Did that include analysis of the fielded
14 completions functionality?
15 A. [SEARS] That's going to take a minute to
16 get an answer to.
17 (Pause.)
18 A. [SEARS] I'll try to give you a concise
19 answer. We did look for the presence or absence of
20 what are known as fielded completions. We did not
21 design a test to see if those fielded completions
22 were presented in a standard format, because to our
23 understanding a standard format for fielded
24 completions doesn't exist. So we looked for

Page 5037

1 presence or absence. We looked to see if the format
2 was different than the standard completion notice
3 that we had been receiving, but we did not do any
4 investigation into the actual presentation of data
5 within the fielded completion, which my
6 understanding is is exclusively within the remarks
7 section of the response.
8 Q. And you indicate that it's your
9 understanding that there's no standard format for
10 fielded completions. Could you explain what you
11 mean?
12 A. [BOWERS] The business rules do not, as
13 they're currently laid out, do not have a list of
14 fields that will show up in a fielded completion.
15 Q. Is it your understanding that the format of
16 the fielded completions is going to vary by order
17 type, or are you saying something other than that?
18 A. [SEARS] The answer is we don't know. We
19 didn't do -- the answer is we don't know.
20 Q. So KPMG's uncertain whether for any given
21 order type the format of the fielded completion
22 response should be standard.
23 A. [DELLATORRE] Correct.
24 A. [SEARS] I think what we've already stated

1 is that it's our belief, as we sit here today, that
2 there is not a standard format type for -- or there
3 are not standard formatting rules for fielded
4 completions.

5 Q. Right. And then I asked the followup
6 question, as to whether you were simply pointing to
7 the fact that there may be different formats for
8 different order types or whether you were pointing
9 to something else, and I thought the answer was that
10 KPMG did not know.

11 A. [SEARS] I'm going to ask that you bear with
12 us for an overnight investigation on this one so we
13 can go back and look at our workpapers and see what
14 we actually saw. Is that okay?

15 Q. I think you indicated you did look to see
16 whether there was a presence or absence of a fielded
17 completion response in LSOG 4?

18 A. [SEARS] We looked to see if the format of
19 the response had changed versus what we were used to
20 seeing there. So we did see changes in the format
21 of the response.

22 Q. Did you make any effort to validate the data
23 that was provided in the fielded completion
24 response?

1 Q. When you do the final-final draft report --
2 excuse me, the final-final report, which presumably
3 will be issued at the conclusion of these hearings,
4 will you have listed at the bottom of each page the
5 same notation that this report is confidential and
6 not subject to public disclosure? Or will you
7 remove that notation?

8 A. [SEARS] You know, I don't know the answer
9 to that question.

10 Q. I'm hoping the answer is yes, because we've
11 been having technical hearings today that have not
12 been under seal and they've all related to this
13 particular document. So I would appreciate it if
14 you would consider removing that, with the
15 Department's discretion on that.

16 A. [SEARS] I really think that's at the
17 discretion of the DTE and not at my discretion.
18 It's something we customarily put on these things.
19 But I'll leave that up to the DTE, to direct us to
20 make that determination. It's not going to be my
21 decision. There's nothing in here that I believe is
22 confidential to KPMG. There's information that
23 other parties may believe, or disguised and
24 aggregated information that other parties may

1 A. [SEARS] No.

2 MR. SALINGER: A quick off-the-record
3 question?

4 MS. CARPINO: Off the record.
5 (Discussion off the record.)

6 MS. CARPINO: Back on the record. Ms.
7 Reed, you have a followup?

8 MS. REED: Yes, a followup question to
9 what Mr. Salinger mentioned.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MS. REED:

12 Q. It regards the volume-testing six-month
13 period. Mr. Sears, I believe you mentioned that you
14 estimated that six months from the report date of
15 May 1st, 2000; is that correct?

16 A. [SEARS] I hope that's correct.

17 Q. When you said report date, did you mean the
18 initial draft report date, the second draft report
19 date, or the final-final report date?

20 A. [SEARS] The initial draft report date was
21 intended to be issued in May.

22 Q. So you were counting the six-month period
23 from when the initial draft report is released.

24 A. [SEARS] That's correct.

1 believe is confidential.

2 MS. REED: Thank you. I have nothing
3 else.

4 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Salinger?

5 MR. SALINGER: Before I go back into my
6 questions on that topic, I'll simply state my
7 presumption and hope that if somebody thinks it's
8 wrong that at an appropriate time I'll be disabused
9 of it. I'm presuming, given that the document has
10 been widely distributed, it's been discussed on the
11 public record, and no motion has been for it to be
12 treated as anything other than a public record, it
13 now is a public record.

14 MS. REED: I would prefer that analysis.

15 MS. CARPINO: We wouldn't disabuse you
16 of that notion, Mr. Salinger.

17 FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. SALINGER:

19 Q. Mr. Sears and others, if this question was
20 asked earlier, my apologies: Again with respect to
21 the LSOG 4 feature and functionality testing, on
22 Page 62 of the draft report, the test cross-
23 reference is POP-1-9-4. The comments read that,
24 "KPMG continues to analyze results of due-date

Page 5042

1 accuracy." Could you either remind us if, as I fear
2 you might have, you've already answered that
3 question, or tell us what the status of this portion
4 of your investigation is?
5 A. [SEARS] This is a not satisfied. It's
6 covered by Exception 16.
7 Q. Let's turn to a different topic. At Page 45
8 of this draft of the report, test cross-reference
9 POP-1-1-1. This concerns the question of EDI
10 preorder interface availability. First, if I'm
11 understanding the layout of the report correctly,
12 this particular reference in the report concerns the
13 availability of the LSOG 2 preorder interface; is
14 that correct?
15 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.
16 A. [GIUGNO] Yes.
17 Q. Is it correct that KPMG evaluated EDI
18 preorder interface downtime based solely on
19 information contained in Verizon's reported
20 change-control notices?
21 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes.
22 Q. Is it also true that the applicable
23 carrier-to-carrier metric provides that the
24 calculation of interface downtime should take into

Page 5043

1 account downtime reported in CLEC trouble tickets?
2 A. [DELLATORRE] I don't have that reference.
3 Q. Perhaps you'd care to turn to KPMG's
4 Exception Report No. 9, Issue 9.2, second paragraph.
5 Do you have that available?
6 A. [DELLATORRE] We have the exception
7 available. We do not have to carrier-to-carrier
8 definition of the metric, though.
9 Q. If you turn to the exception, you might find
10 you have what you need.
11 MS. CARPINO: If this is a metrics
12 discussion, you may want to hold off until the
13 metrics-domain folks are here, Mr. Salinger.
14 A. [SEARS] The issue that we've got is that
15 our metrics people were not scheduled to be here
16 until Wednesday, and they're not present, and I
17 really don't want my POP team to speculate on the
18 metrics exception. I'd rather have the person who
19 wrote it, who will be here tomorrow, describe what
20 he did.
21 Q. Well, we've got overlapping issues. I don't
22 want to be in a position where I'm trying to follow
23 up this line of questioning --
24 A. [SEARS] I'll keep my people here.

Page 5044

1 Q. Let me finish up the thought for the
2 reporter, please. I don't want to be following up
3 this issue with your metrics person and not have
4 your POP person here. Should we put this on hold
5 until tomorrow?
6 A. [SEARS] I would prefer to do that, and we
7 will have everyone sitting here tomorrow, so you'll
8 have both teams. We'll also, given an indication of
9 what you're looking for, have some time to go and
10 address this overnight.
11 MR. SALINGER: I really do keep finding
12 topics that we can finish today, but I keep striking
13 out. But I'll try to keep doing that for the next
14 19 minutes or so.
15 Q. There was discussion earlier about Test
16 Cross-Reference POP-1-6-1 at Page 56, and in
17 particular the result reported by KPMG regarding
18 inaccurate address validation responses. Do you
19 recall that discussion earlier, Mr. Sears?
20 A. [SEARS] Yes.
21 Q. If I understood correctly, you indicated
22 that a large portion of the 64 percent inaccurate
23 returns concerned multi-family dwelling units, where
24 the issue is whether something was described as a

Page 5045

1 suite or a unit or an apartment number.
2 A. [SEARS] Let me clarify your question. I'm
3 going to actually let the person --
4 It was in this particular field that 64
5 percent of the time we got inaccurate location data.
6 So it wasn't that a large proportion of the 64
7 percent inaccuracies were this problem. This
8 footnote refers specifically to the issues around
9 suite, unit, and apartment.
10 Jim, can you try to give a better answer
11 than I gave previously?
12 A. [BOWERS] That's a good answer in terms of
13 the metric. In terms of what we actually saw, the
14 symptom that we saw was that what was being returned
15 to us was the word "unit," when in fact we should
16 have been receiving the word "apartment," as was
17 indicated on the customer-service record that we had
18 from Bell Atlantic.
19 A. [SEARS] So we did a query. We expected to
20 get "apartment," and we got back "unit" or "suite."
21 Q. For CLECs doing business in urban areas in
22 Massachusetts that are attempting to take preorder
23 responses obtained from Verizon and use them to
24 populate local service requests, isn't this going to

1 be an impediment to doing business?
2 A. [SEARS] It has the potential to be an
3 impediment to doing business, yes. It's a known
4 impediment, and there's a known solution. But yes,
5 it would be nice if it actually returned
6 "apartment."
7 Q. Does KPMG have any information about whether
8 Verizon intends to fix this by returning the correct
9 response in the address validation?
10 A. [SEARS] That would be speculation on my
11 part. I don't know.
12 Q. Another way of stating that is: No, Verizon
13 is not providing any information about an intent to
14 fix this?
15 A. [SEARS] That's correct.
16 Q. Do you have the master test plan available
17 to you?
18 A. [SEARS] Yes, we do.
19 Q. I'm looking at the bottom of Page 20, where
20 at the Department's direction the master test plan
21 includes a description of the military-style test
22 philosophy, indicating that when a problem is
23 encountered Verizon must either clarify the problem
24 in a way that explains -- these are my words, not

1 formal observation or exception, that therefore no
2 fix was required under the military-style philosophy
3 of the testing.
4 A. [SEARS] This particular item, because it
5 was of extremely small overall impact, as far as our
6 overall number of address validation queries, was
7 not deemed to be material enough to enter
8 observation status. It represents a very, very
9 small subset of the total number of address
10 validation queries or the total number of address
11 validation fields returned.
12 Q. Again, it's late in the day; I'm sure it's
13 my fault, but I feel like we're going in circles.
14 Does it or does it not matter that a problem has not
15 been memorialized as an observation when it comes to
16 applying the military-style test philosophy?
17 A. [SEARS] I believe that the military-style
18 test philosophy section was written with the
19 intent -- because if you look at Bullet No. 2, it
20 talks about Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts will
21 submit a formal response to the problem identified
22 by KPMG. I think implicit in this set of bullets is
23 the observations-and-exceptions process. There is
24 not -- I don't believe there's another forum for

1 the Department's or the master plan -- that explains
2 why it's not a problem or has to provide a fix for
3 the problem. Has Verizon done either of those with
4 respect to this issue on inaccurate address
5 validation responses?
6 A. [SEARS] The answer is that this particular
7 issue never reached the status of observation or
8 exception and as a consequence would not have
9 triggered this sequence of events.
10 Q. I'm sure it's that I'm slow at the end of
11 the day, but where in the master test plan does it
12 state that the military-style test philosophy will
13 only apply to items identified as a formal
14 observation or exception by KPMG?
15 A. [SEARS] It probably doesn't state it in
16 there.
17 Q. But is that in fact the testing philosophy
18 that KPMG has applied, that problems not
19 memorialized in a formal observation or exception
20 did not need to be fixed?
21 A. [SEARS] No.
22 Q. Then perhaps, Mr. Sears, you could explain
23 the point of your statement a moment ago that this
24 particular problem had not been memorialized in a

1 Bell Atlantic to submit a formal response and create
2 a retest environment.
3 So I don't believe it's explicit in the
4 language here -- it's not explicit in the language.
5 Clearly these four bullets apply -- well, actually,
6 there are some situations where there are
7 observations where there are not even Bell Atlantic
8 fixes. So there is some sort of materiality
9 construct that overlays the military-style test
10 philosophy. There are, for example, I'm sure,
11 documentation errors that are not fixed, that we
12 would not have believed impeded the ability to close
13 a test out, even given military-style test
14 philosophy.
15 Q. So is it your testimony that problems
16 identified by KPMG during the course of its testing
17 that for whatever reason were not memorialized in a
18 formal observation or exception are not things that
19 KPMG had been directed by the master test plan to
20 make sure were fixed?
21 A. [SEARS] It's my testimony that there are
22 errors that were found by KPMG and problems that
23 were found by KPMG that are not fixed, that are not
24 subject to the military-style test philosophy

1 because they're not material problems. I don't know
2 if that answers your question, though.

3 Q. It doesn't, actually.. I was asking what I
4 had hoped was a more precise question, trying to
5 follow up on your earlier comments. Is it KPMG's
6 understanding that it was only being directed by the
7 master test plan to ensure that problems identified
8 in formal observations or exceptions were fixed but
9 that problems identified by KPMG and not
10 memorialized in a formal observation or exception
11 don't have to be fixed?

12 A. [SEARS] I don't know that I can answer that
13 question directly, because oftentimes observations
14 and exceptions resulted from situations where we
15 used another mechanism to identify a problem that
16 Bell Atlantic subsequently fixed, and those sorts of
17 things would never have entered the observations-
18 and-exceptions process. There were probably
19 hundreds of problems that KPMG encountered during
20 this process that were fixed by Bell Atlantic and
21 there was no observation or exception opened. So I
22 can't sit here and tell you that problems that were
23 found by KPMG that didn't hit observations or
24 exceptions status didn't get fixed. That's simply

1 were lots of things that got fixed quickly enough
2 that writing an observation or an exception wasn't
3 even a relevant topic. We had a problem, it got
4 fixed the next day. If it had taken a month to get
5 fixed, it certainly would have gotten an
6 observation. The fact that it got fixed the next
7 day precluded the need to write an observation.

8 Observations and exceptions are just one
9 of the variety of ways that we reported problems to
10 Bell Atlantic and got things fixed, and they tend to
11 be major problems. Exceptions clearly are ones that
12 would be report-impacting. They tended to be things
13 that took a while to get fixed, that weren't fixed
14 on an instantaneous basis. And they tend to in most
15 cases be material.

16 Q. Mr. Sears, I've been pressing for this
17 clarification because, in response to my questions
18 about the address validation responses, you
19 indicated, I believe twice, that KPMG felt this
20 didn't need to be fixed because it never became an
21 observation or an exception. I'm trying to
22 understand why that would be so.

23 A. [SEARS] I hopefully didn't say that. What
24 I said was KPMG concluded that this was not material

1 not true. In fact, observations and exceptions
2 tended to get opened when the level of visibility
3 around those problems needed to be raised.

4 You can look at the CTE process as a
5 great example. There were lots and lots of
6 documentation and EDI map fixes made by Bell
7 Atlantic. Each individual one of those things is
8 not documented in an observation and exception, and
9 yet there are a tremendous majority of them that are
10 fixed.

11 I don't want to leave you with the
12 impression that just because it didn't hit
13 observation or exception status it didn't get fixed.
14 That's simply not true. But if the question is if
15 there was something that was not material enough to
16 get raised to the observation or exception level
17 could the test be completed without that being
18 fixed, the answer is yes.

19 Q. If I understand your statement correctly,
20 some things, some problems, which were not
21 memorialized as a formal observation or exception
22 were things that KPMG concluded that needed to be
23 fixed. Others were not.

24 A. [SEARS] It's the KPMG conclusion that there

1 and as a consequence there was no observation
2 generated.

3 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Sears, was KPMG's
4 application or interpretation of the military-style
5 philosophy in Massachusetts consistent with KPMG's
6 interpretation, application of the military-style
7 philosophy in New York?

8 WITNESS SEARS: Yes. And what you'll
9 actually find, digging myself a hole, is that there
10 are situations where the test criteria provides you
11 with information about problems that we found where
12 no observation or exception was generated, that are
13 not different in substance than what we're talking
14 about here.

15 MR. SALINGER: Ms. Carpino, at this
16 point I think it's four minutes of 5:00, and unless
17 you want to go past 5:00 o'clock, it probably would
18 be disruptive if we didn't stop here.

19 MS. CARPINO: I think all of us want to
20 take a break right now.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. CARPINO: Let's adjourn for the day
23 and resume at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow.

24 (4:56 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE

2
3 I. Alan H. Brock, Registered Professional
4 Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5 transcript is a true and accurate transcription of
6 my stenographic notes taken on August 28, 2000.

7
8
9
10 _____
11 Alan H. Brock, RDR/CRR
12

13 INDEX

14
15 OSS testing: general questions
16 KEVIN MERRITT, RAYMOND W. SEARS, III,
17 JOSEPH DELLATORRE, and MARIE HOLMES,
18 4879 by Mr. McDonald
19 4897 by Ms. Reed
20 OSS testing: M&R
21 4899 by Mr. McDonald
22 4906 by Mr. Salinger
23 OSS testing: billing
24 4911 by Mr. Salinger

1 OSS testing: POP
2 RAYMOND W. SEARS, III, JOSEPH DELLATORRE,
3 STEPHEN SESKO, JAMES BOWERS, NICOLE GIUGNO,
4 and PHILIP N. PHAN
5 4919 by Ms. Johnson
6 4981 by Mr. McDonald
7 4990 by Ms. Scardino
8 5017 by Ms. Parker
9 5023 by Ms. Scardino
10 5025 by Ms. Parker
11 5027 by Mr. Salinger
12 5039 by Ms. Reed
13 5041 by Mr. Salinger
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 VOL. 26, PAGES 5056-5252
2 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
3 DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY
4 DTE 99-271

5
6 TECHNICAL SESSION held at the Department of
7 Telecommunications and Energy, One South Station,
8 Boston, Massachusetts, on August 29, 2000,
9 commencing at 10:03 a.m., concerning:

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

VERIZON - MASSACHUSETTS

----- ALAN H. BROCK, RDR/CRR -----

FARMER ARSENAULT BROCK LLC
10 MILK STREET - BOSTON, MASS. 02108
617-728-4404

Page 5057

1 SITTING: Paul B. Vasington, Commissioner
2 Cathy Carpino, Hearing Officer
3 Scott Simon, Analyst
4
5 APPEARANCES:
6
7 Bruce P. Beausejour, Esq.
8 Verizon - Massachusetts
9 185 Franklin Street, Room 1403
10 Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1585
11
12 Donald C. Rowe, Esq.
13 Bell Atlantic - New York
14 1095 Avenue of The Americas, Room 3744
15 New York, New York 10036
16 for Verizon - Massachusetts
17
18
19 Karlen J. Reed, Esq.
20 Assistant Attorney General
21 Regulated Industries Division
22 200 Portland Street, Fourth Floor
23 Boston, Massachusetts 02114
24 for the Office of the Attorney General

Page 5058

1 Jeffrey F. Jones, Esq.
2 Kenneth W. Salinger, Esq.
3 Jay E. Gruber, Esq.
4 Palmer & Dodge
5 One Beacon Street
6 Boston, Massachusetts 02108
7 for AT&T Communications of New England
8
9 Susan Jin Davis, Esq.
10 Covad Communications Company
11 600 14th Street, Suite 750
12 Washington, D.C. 20005
13
14 Christopher J. McDonald, Esq.
15 Cynthia Carney Johnson, Esq.
16 WorldCom, Inc.
17 200 Park Avenue, Sixth Floor
18 New York, New York 10166
19
20 Stacey L. Parker, Esq.
21 MediaOne Communications of Massachusetts
22 Riverbend Business Park
23 6 Campanelli Drive
24 Andover, Massachusetts 01810-1095

Page 5059

1 Kimberly A. Scardino, Esq.
2 Assistant General Counsel
3 Rhythms Links, Inc.
4 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 300
5 Washington, D.C. 20036
6
7
8 ALSO SPEAKING: Karen Kinard, WorldCom
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Page 5060

1 August 29, 2000 10:03 a.m.
2 PROCEEDINGS
3 MS. CARPINO: Let's go back on the
4 record. Good morning. My name is Cathy Carpino.
5 Joining me on the bench this morning are
6 Commissioner Paul Vasington and Scott Simon.
7 Before we return to POP questioning by
8 Mr. Salinger, we have a few housekeeping matters to
9 attend to. We have some new faces in the room for
10 KPMG, so I'm going to ask those individuals to
11 identify themselves, and then I'll swear you in.
12 WITNESS HEMPHILL: Benjamin J. Hemphill.
13 WITNESS REDCHUK: Nicholas P. Redchuk.
14 WITNESS SCHWARTZ: Tobias Schwartz.
15 MS. CARPINO: Gentlemen, will you please
16 raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that
17 the testimony you are about to give will be the
18 whole truth?
19 THE WITNESSES: Yes.
20 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Sears or Mr.
21 DellaTorre, you have some information in response to
22 questions that were asked of you yesterday. Do you
23 want to provide that now?
24 WITNESS DELLATORRE: Certainly. We have

1 the information on the flow-through scenarios that
2 was discussed yesterday, the list of flow-throughs
3 that KPMG found that were expected to flow through
4 and did not. We can elaborate a little bit on that
5 now. Jim?

6 WITNESS BOWERS: Thanks, Joe. There
7 were nine scenarios where KPMG made an initial
8 incorrect assessment. There was a scenario where we
9 did a migrate as specified with change to hunting,
10 that we thought would flow through and it did not.
11 Bell Atlantic later changed their documentation.

12 We did a disconnect of a resale line
13 with change to hunting scenario; the same reason:
14 We expected it to flow through and it did not. Bell
15 Atlantic later changed their documentation. We did
16 a disconnect -- those are both resale scenarios.

17 UNE-loop scenarios, we did an EEL
18 disconnect and also a CLEC-to-CLEC loop migration.

19 MS. SCARDINO: On the UNE-loop
20 disconnect and the CLEC-to-CLEC migration, did Bell
21 Atlantic subsequently change its documentation?

22 WITNESS BOWERS: Yes, they did.

23 MS. CARPINO: Is there anything else?

24 WITNESS BOWERS: Not on that question.

1 WITNESS BOWERS: Can you repeat the
2 question?

3 RAYMOND W. SEARS, III, JOSEPH
4 DELLATORRE, STEPHEN SESKO, JAMES BOWERS,
5 and NICOLE GIUGNO, and AARON FOSTER,
6 Witnesses

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 BY MS. SCARDINO:

9 Q. Yesterday I had asked about the live help-
10 desk testing, and KPMG had stated that they did not
11 perform live help-desk observations but that they
12 had conducted CLEC surveys and questionnaires.

13 A. [BOWERS] Right.

14 Q. And that particular person that had
15 conducted those surveys was not available yesterday,
16 but I understood would be available today.

17 A. [BOWERS] Right. And we do have some
18 information on that point. According to the
19 interviews of CLECs, the CLECs told us some of the
20 following information. We were informed that the
21 GUI help desk was particularly slow. It was our
22 experience that they were relatively fast, and by
23 that I mean less than ten seconds to pick up the
24 phone at the GUI help desk.

1 MS. CARPINO: Any other loose ends that
2 you want to tie up this morning?

3 MR. SALINGER: The loose ends that arose
4 during my questioning I'll make sure we go back and
5 tie up.

6 WITNESS DELLATORRE: That was
7 anticipated.

8 MS. CARPINO: Ms. Parker?

9 MS. PARKER: There were some LNP
10 questions that were outstanding as well.

11 MS. CARPINO: LNP questions?

12 WITNESS BOWERS: With LSOG 2 there were
13 two instances with stand-alone LNP. Both of those
14 received timely and accurate LSCs.

15 In the LSOG 4 test there were five
16 instances of stand-alone LNP. All five of them
17 received complete and accurate and timely LSCs,
18 PCNs, and BCNs. On those particular orders AT&T
19 provided us with resources which were live, so those
20 orders were able to complete.

21 MS. SCARDINO: Can I add some followup
22 questions as well on the help-desk CLEC services
23 that were conducted?

24 MS. CARPINO: All right.

1 We were also informed that CLECs were
2 receiving late LSCs. However, we found in our
3 testing for that the percentage to be very small.

4 We were also informed by CLECs that when
5 calling the BASS that ticket numbers were not always
6 given without having to ask for a ticket number. We
7 also found that to be true.

8 Those are the high points from our CLEC
9 interviews.

10 Q. On the GUI help desk, when you had stated
11 that CLECs had said that it was particularly slow,
12 can you elaborate on what the CLECs had stated about
13 that?

14 A. [BOWERS] We were informed that -- the time
15 to pick up the phone call, so it would continue to
16 ring --

17 It would just continue to ring. It was
18 a matter of minutes, as opposed to our experience,
19 which was seconds, less than ten seconds.

20 Q. And how frequently did you call the GUI help
21 desk?

22 A. [BOWERS] Not very frequently.

23 A. [SEARS] We did not have a huge sample of
24 GUI orders in the tests, so we didn't have a

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5065</p> <p>1 tremendous opportunity to call the GUI help desk 2 very often. 3 Q. Do you have the number of the GUI orders 4 that you actually submitted during the test? 5 A. [SEARS] We can get that for you right now. 6 (Pause.) 7 A. [DELLATORRE] As a reference, in the POP 2 8 GUI test, test cross-reference POP-2-2-1, we 9 referred to 155 preorder transactions submitted 10 during the functional evaluation. 169 order 11 transactions submitted during the functional 12 evaluation. 13 Q. And you had testified that you used a secure 14 ID card to access the GUI? 15 A. [DELLATORRE] Correct. 16 Q. Are you aware of the fact that a lot of 17 CLECs do not use secure ID cards and actually access 18 the GUI via the Internet? 19 A. [SEARS] We're aware that CLECs do that, 20 yes. 21 Q. Was any of that type of testing conducted? 22 A. [DELLATORRE] No. 23 A. [SEARS] No. 24 MS. CARPINO: Ms. Jin Davis?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5067</p> <p>1 many orders were, for example, DSL loop orders? 2 A. [DELLATORRE] That is correct. 3 Q. Can you provide that breakdown for us? 4 A. [DELLATORRE] I don't believe we have that 5 available. 6 Q. Here or at all? 7 A. [SEARS] We have not performed any analysis 8 disaggregated below the level of UNE-L, UNE-P, and 9 resale. The test was not designed to produce 10 reliable data at a level below that, and we have not 11 done that analysis. 12 Q. Can you do that analysis? 13 A. [SEARS] It's possible, yes. 14 Q. Will you do that analysis? 15 A. [SEARS] If my client asks me to do that 16 analysis, I'll do that analysis. 17 MS. JIN DAVIS: I'd like to make that a 18 request. I'm not sure, Ms. Carpino, how you'd like 19 to handle on-the-record data requests with regard to 20 KPMG's test. But I'd like to put the request on the 21 record, and I can also put it in writing. My 22 request would be to have disaggregation of the GUI 23 orders analyzed by KPMG with regard to the 155 24 preorder transactions that were analyzed, as well as</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5066</p> <p>1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. JIN DAVIS: 3 Q. I'm Susan Jin Davis, from Covad 4 Communications. I have some followup on Ms. 5 Scardino's followup. 6 You indicated that you looked at 155 7 preorder transactions; is that correct? 8 A. [SEARS] On the GUI, yes. 9 A. [DELLATORRE] For the GUI. 10 Q. Is that aggregated data that includes both 11 voice and DSL loops? 12 A. [SEARS] It's actually across a broad 13 spectrum of preorder transactions. I think it's 14 across 13 different transaction types. 15 Q. Can you provide a breakdown of the order 16 types that were analyzed -- 17 A. [DELLATORRE] It actually can be found in 18 the report, beginning on Page 70, Table 2-1, 2-2, 19 2-3. I believe there are eight or nine tables in 20 total that reference which types of orders and 21 preorders we transacted across the GUI. That's 22 Table 2-1 through Table 2-13. 23 Q. Am I correct, however, that these tables do 24 not include a numerical breakdown as to exactly how</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5068</p> <p>1 the 169 order transactions that were analyzed. And 2 in particular, the breakout should include the 3 number of DSL orders that were looked at in both 4 those categories of orders for GUI transactions. 5 MS. CARPINO: We'll take it under 6 advisement, and I'll mark it as proposed Record 7 Request EE. 8 (RECORD REQUEST.) 9 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Sears, you indicated 10 that KPMG is of the view that this information is 11 not statistically significant? 12 WITNESS SEARS: There are elements of it 13 that would not have much statistical significance. 14 It really depends on the actual quantity that were 15 done of a given type. 16 MS. CARPINO: Should the Department 17 decide to direct you to provide this level of 18 detail, how long do you anticipate it would take? 19 WITNESS SEARS: I really would prefer to 20 come back to you with an answer on that. I don't 21 know. 22 MS. JIN DAVIS: Your Honor, I also have 23 a number of other questions related to DSL that go 24 into the area of getting disaggregated data. So</p>

1 actually my request is broader than what I've just
2 stated on the record, which is: I'd like to see
3 disaggregated loop data for all POP domains, and in
4 particular information on Bell Atlantic or Verizon's
5 performance on DSL loops. So I'd like to expand the
6 request in that manner.

7 MS. CARPINO: We'll modify that proposed
8 record request.

9 (RECORD REQUEST AMENDMENT.)

10 MS. CARPINO: Does KPMG have any
11 comments about that?

12 WITNESS SEARS: No. We're willing to
13 have a discussion with you about the pros and cons
14 or pitfalls of doing that. There are some areas in
15 the report where xDSL data is available in a
16 disaggregated way already -- for example, in the
17 provisioning sections -- and we should probably
18 touch on those later.

19 MS. CARPINO: Ms. Parker, you had a
20 followup?

21 MS. PARKER: I'm sorry, I didn't have a
22 chance to ask it before we jumped topics.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MS. PARKER:

1 Q. Is that the same data that you just
2 reported --

3 A. [BOWERS] Yes, for those same orders.

4 Q. So that was evaluated for both the flow-
5 through and the ordering and the provisioning.

6 A. [DELLATORRE] Correct.

7 A. [BOWERS] Correct.

8 MS. PARKER: Thank you.

9 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Salinger, my notes
10 indicate that you had a few questions that were
11 unanswered yesterday, too, so why don't we resume.

12 MR. SALINGER: Yes, there were a few
13 unanswered questions, and as a result of which, some
14 areas that we didn't finish exploring.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. SALINGER:

17 Q. One of them had to do with the area of
18 fielded completions functionality in the LSOG 4 EDI
19 systems. I probably should have done a better job
20 of setting the stage for that yesterday. Could
21 somebody just describe very briefly what the fielded
22 completions functionality is intended to provide
23 CLECs with?

24 A. [BOWERS] My understanding of fielded

1 Q. Could I direct KPMG back to LNP just for a
2 moment. The numbers that you've reported on the
3 LSOG 2 and the LSOG 4 tests for stand-alone LNP,
4 could you clarify whether or not those numbers would
5 equal a statistically significant trial as a
6 stand-alone?

7 A. [SEARS] Not likely.

8 Q. And just to clarify on the LSOG 4 test: You
9 said that you received timely LSCs and PCNs and --

10 A. [SEARS] BCNs.

11 Q. Does that mean that it was in fact actually
12 provisioned?

13 A. [SEARS] Yes, these were provisioned on the
14 CLEC switch.

15 Q. They were. And you said that the live
16 resources were provided by AT&T. Is that AT&T or
17 AT&T Broadband, formerly MediaOne?

18 A. [SEARS] It's whoever is using the CIC code
19 TCGI.

20 A. [DELLATORRE] It's likely AT&T.

21 Q. One more followup question from yesterday:
22 I believe you are going to evaluate or let me know
23 if LNP was evaluated as a flow-through.

24 A. [BOWERS] It was, and it did.

1 completions is, before this was implemented, in the
2 remarks section a CLEC was essentially seeing an
3 image of the service order. Fielded completions, as
4 has been explained to me, is taking that image and
5 essentially parsing it into fields and then
6 reporting in apparently a more organized manner the
7 same information that was previously supplied.

8 Q. You're aware that this is a functionality
9 that CLECs have been seeking from Verizon for quite
10 some time?

11 A. [BOWERS] I'm not aware of that.

12 A. [DELLATORRE] Yes, I am.

13 Q. This is a functionality that's not available
14 in the LSOG 2 EDI systems; correct?

15 A. [BOWERS] Correct.

16 Q. It became available for the first time with
17 the June release of the LSOG 4 systems?

18 A. [BOWERS] Correct.

19 Q. Yesterday, Mr. Sears, you indicated that
20 KPMG did not design a test to see if the fielded-
21 completions responses were presented by Verizon in a
22 standard format, because you didn't believe that a
23 standard format existed. I pressed you on that, and
24 it was probably obvious from my questions that we

1 understood that for any particular order type there
2 was a standard format, even though the format may
3 differ among order types. Mr. Sears, you asked to
4 have time to check your workpapers overnight, to be
5 able to respond to that line of questioning. Have
6 you had a chance to do so?

7 A. [SEARS] Yes, I have.

8 Q. And do you have any further information to
9 provide about the extent to which fielded
10 completions are presented in a standard format?

11 A. [SEARS] I did not investigate that because
12 it became clear overnight that we did not test
13 fielded completions. We looked for a change in the
14 format as far as executing a test that would see
15 whether or not Bell Atlantic was providing those
16 fields of compliance with business rules. That was
17 a test that was not done.

18 Q. So you did feature and functionality tests
19 of the LSOG 4 systems, but at least in this instance
20 you didn't test all of the features or
21 functionalities?

22 A. [SEARS] That's correct.

23 Q. Is there a reason why you didn't test the
24 fielded-completions functionality?

1 metric for the interface availability requires that
2 outages as reported by CLECs be taken into account?

3 A. [SEARS] Yes, I am, and we need to do a
4 little housekeeping first. Alan Salzberg, who
5 actually ran the metrics test, is unfortunately with
6 his wife in the hospital in New York, so I've
7 brought the rest of the members of the team, who
8 unfortunately need to be sworn in, and then they can
9 answer your question.

10 MS. CARPINO: Will those individuals
11 please identify themselves.

12 WITNESS FOSTER: Aaron Foster.

13 WITNESS YATES: Beth Yates.

14 MS. CARPINO: Will you please raise your
15 right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the
16 testimony you are about to provide will be the whole
17 truth?

18 THE WITNESSES: I do.

19 BY MR. SALINGER:

20 Q. What I'm seeking confirmation of is that the
21 applicable carrier-to-carrier metric for a
22 particular preorder interface availability requires
23 that interface outages as reported by CLECs on their
24 trouble tickets be taken into account.

1 A. [SEARS] I don't recall the reason why we
2 didn't test the fielded-completions functionality,
3 but it was not tested.

4 Q. Another area of inquiry that we didn't
5 complete, I believe, Mr. Sears, because you wanted
6 to have one of your metrics experts available
7 today -- I'd begun asking questions about your
8 investigation into preorder interface downtime. Do
9 you recall that, late yesterday?

10 A. [SEARS] Yes, I do.

11 Q. Now, Verizon's metrics witness, Julie Canny,
12 testified that the carrier-to-carrier metric
13 definition of interface availability requires an
14 accounting not just of the results from the EnView
15 robot but also of outages reported by CLECs via
16 trouble tickets, and the record cite for that is the
17 transcript from August 22nd at Pages 2888 through
18 2889. Yesterday, Mr. Sears, I drew your attention
19 to KPMG's Exception 9.2, I believe in the second
20 paragraph, that I thought confirmed that point, and
21 you asked that we hold off on getting an answer on
22 whether that's correct or not until you had your
23 metrics person available today. Are you able to
24 respond now as to whether the carrier-to-carrier

1 A. [DELLATORRE] We have confirmed that that is
2 in fact the definition.

3 Q. Yesterday, I think you've already confirmed
4 that KPMG, in evaluating the extent of interface
5 downtime, did not look at outages as reported by
6 CLECs in trouble tickets but instead looked solely
7 at the information provided by Verizon in change-
8 control notices. Is that correct?

9 A. [SEARS] I'd like to make a clarification
10 there. It was really a two-part test, one of which
11 was highly subjective, which was our own experience
12 with outages from an operational standpoint, and
13 then was using Bell Atlantic's self-reported data to
14 confirm whether or not there were outages that we
15 didn't see that they were reporting.

16 Q. But did you also review CLEC reports of
17 outages in CLEC trouble tickets?

18 A. [SEARS] No, we did not.

19 Q. Why not?

20 A. [SEARS] Because the intent of that
21 evaluation criteria was to give our experience as a
22 CLEC. The metrics evaluation was designed to
23 evaluate whether or not Bell Atlantic's metrics
24 reporting on that particular evaluation criteria was

Page 5077

1 accurate. So fundamentally in our analysis of the
2 metrics reports we would have included the reported
3 outages. Those sections of the report, like most
4 POP sections, are designed to report our, KPMG's,
5 CLEC-like experience. The metrics sections of the
6 report are designed to report and opine on the
7 overall Bell Atlantic metrics, which would include
8 that CLEC outage time.

9 Q. Well, I'm confused, because what you say
10 doesn't seem to be entirely consistent with what the
11 report says on Page 45 with respect to test cross-
12 reference POP-1-1-1. There's no commentary there
13 whatsoever about KPMG's subjective experience of
14 interface availability, but, rather, there is a
15 report on what KPMG found when it reviewed Bell
16 Atlantic change-control notices.

17 A. [SEARS] I agree. We need to clarify that.

18 Q. Let me reask a prior question, then. If
19 KPMG took the step of looking at Bell Atlantic
20 change-control notices to get a partial picture of
21 the history of interface availability, why as part
22 of its review did KPMG not also look at interface
23 outages as reported by CLECs on their trouble
24 tickets?

Page 5078

1 A. [SEARS] The only answer I have is because
2 we did that in the metrics section.

3 Q. Could you give us a cross-reference where in
4 the metrics section we can find that?

5 (Pause.)

6 A. [DELLATORRE] I'm trying to find the spot in
7 the metrics portion of the report that addresses
8 this issue. However, the metrics test for these
9 metrics, as well as all of the rest, was meant as a
10 validation of how Bell Atlantic calculates the
11 metric, not a presentation of those metrics numbers.
12 Bell Atlantic presents those numbers to various
13 state commissions on their performance. So we did
14 not replicate those numbers here. Those numbers are
15 publicly available.

16 The point of our test was to replicate
17 those numbers and to make sure that the algorithms
18 that were in place are correct and correctly
19 calculated, but we did not present the end result of
20 those calculations because those are publicly
21 available numbers.

22 Q. It would help me if we took things one step
23 at a time. There was a question that Mr. Sears
24 asked to take back overnight about evaluation of the

Page 5079

1 interface availability within the POP domain, and
2 the answer presented this morning is that the
3 information that I'm seeking is not in the POP
4 section but it's in the metrics section. Give that
5 that's KPMG's response to the question that it took
6 back last night, could we start with finding out
7 where in the metrics-domain report the relevant
8 portion of this test is referenced?

9 A. [SEARS] The relevant cross-reference is
10 PMR-1-1-8 on Page 647 of the report.

11 Q. And on this particular evaluation criterion
12 KPMG has concluded that this criterion is not
13 satisfied?

14 A. [SEARS] That is in the process of changing.
15 This was one of four not-satisfieds in the metrics
16 section, of which two are going to be changed to
17 satisfied.

18 Q. In reviewing the calculation of metric
19 values for EDI preorder interface availability, did
20 KPMG review CLEC trouble tickets regarding interface
21 outages during relevant periods and attempt to
22 reconcile those with the metric results being
23 reported by Verizon?
24 (Pause.)

Page 5080

1 A. [SEARS] Because Alan is not here, it's
2 going to take me at least five minutes to answer
3 your question.

4 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Salinger, is it
5 possible to move along and come back to this?

6 MR. SALINGER: Sure. I thought that's
7 what we did with the overnight break. But if the
8 court reporter might be good enough to keep track of
9 the pending question when we return to it, I'll ask
10 him to reread it to jog my memory to get us
11 restarted.

12 Q. Mr. Sears, turning back to this issue within
13 the POP domain with respect to test cross-reference
14 POP-1-1-1: You indicated a few minutes ago that the
15 point of this test was primarily to capture KPMG's
16 subjective experience with interface availability;
17 is that correct?

18 A. [SEARS] It was designed to capture KPMG's
19 subjective experience and then validate it with Bell
20 Atlantic's reported data. In other words, we would
21 have looked for our own trouble tickets or
22 situations where we had called the help desk to say,
23 "Your systems are down." Unfortunately, we didn't
24 open any trouble tickets on systems availability

1 during the conduct of the test, so we had no
2 self-reported data to rely on; and that's one of the
3 reasons we went and looked at Bell Atlantic's
4 change-control documentation, because we hadn't
5 opened up tickets.
6 Q. So from the perspective of this particular
7 POP test, when you were trying to verify KPMG's
8 subjective experience regarding preorder interface
9 availability, you looked at Verizon's change-control
10 notices, but for this purpose you did not look at
11 CLEC reports of interface outages on their trouble
12 tickets.
13 A. [SEARS] Right, because we would have used
14 our CLEC reports, if we had generated any, as a
15 proxy for that. Just we didn't happen to have any
16 during the conduct of this test.
17 Q. So you were not making a determination in
18 this test whether KPMG's subjective experience at
19 all matched the real-world commercial experience of
20 CLECs.
21 A. [SEARS] No, that's what the carrier-to-
22 carrier metrics would show you.
23 Q. Let's turn back to the general topic of
24 KPMG's volume testing of the LSOG 2 EDI systems that

1 we started yesterday. I can tell by the grin on
2 your face, Mr. Sears, that you're pleased we're
3 returning to this topic.
4 A. [SEARS] Absolutely. Well, we'll see in
5 five minutes.
6 (Laughter.)
7 Q. There was one minor point that I had pressed
8 yesterday. I don't know whether you had a chance to
9 learn anything more overnight. We had not
10 specifically flagged it for you to take back. But I
11 was trying to find out exactly when in time the four
12 days of volume testing took place. Thumbs-up means
13 what, Mr. Sears?
14 A. [SEARS] Thumbs-up means that we know.
15 Q. Could you tell us?
16 A. [SEARS] Sure.
17 A. [BOWERS] May 26, May 31, June 2, June 6.
18 Q. And which of those days involved testing at
19 the normal volume levels, which at the peak, and
20 which at the stress level?
21 A. [BOWERS] Exactly in that order. So the
22 26th and 31st were normal, the 2nd was peak, and the
23 6th was stress.
24 Q. The question that I asked yesterday, which

1 prompted, I think, Mr. Sears's suggestion that we
2 put off the questions in this area until today, was
3 the question: What was the October volume forecast
4 to which KPMG tested?
5 (Pause.)
6 A. [BOWERS] We have the numbers for what we
7 actually sent. What we don't have is the filed
8 projection, which will include the commercial
9 volumes. We're going to get that number for you
10 right now.
11 Q. How long will it take you to get that
12 number?
13 A. [BOWERS] It should be minutes.
14 MR. SALINGER: It may be less confusing
15 to those in the room, and certainly less confusing
16 on the transcript, if we have this line of
17 questioning broken only into two chunks, from last
18 night and today, instead of it having been broken up
19 into smaller chunks. Does it make sense to wait a
20 moment?
21 MS. CARPINO: Do you require about a
22 five-minute break?
23 WITNESS SEARS: That would be very
24 helpful.

1 MS. CARPINO: Let's do that.
2 (Recess taken.)
3 MS. CARPINO: Let's go back on the
4 record. Mr. Sears, you have a response to -- which
5 question? I'm not sure.
6 MR. SALINGER: Why don't I restate the
7 question so the record is clearer.
8 MS. CARPINO: All right.
9 Q. The question that I think we paused on is
10 the same one that we paused on yesterday: What was
11 the October volume forecast to which KPMG tested?
12 A. [SEARS] 21,738 orders per day.
13 Q. Can you say that more slowly, please?
14 A. [SEARS] Sure. 21,738 orders per day.
15 Q. And how many preorder transactions per day?
16 A. [SEARS] Double that.
17 I'm sorry; it's 2.5 times that.
18 Q. Are those the volumes of orders per day that
19 KPMG was sending, or is that the total including
20 commercial orders?
21 A. [SEARS] That's the forecast volume that
22 would have included both commercial orders and KPMG
23 orders.
24 Q. So of the 21,738, approximately how many per

Page 5085

1 day were being generated by KPMG?
2 A. [SEARS] On a normal day, 3,167.
3 Q. I thank you for reminding me, Mr. Sears:
4 The 21,738 is the normal-day volume; correct?
5 A. [SEARS] That's correct.
6 Q. Of this universe, is that just EDI orders,
7 or does that include GUI?
8 A. [SEARS] No, it's a combination of EDI and
9 GUI orders.
10 Q. What's the split between EDI and GUI?
11 A. [SEARS] Of the 3167, 3,040 were run on EDI
12 and 127 were run on the GUI.
13 Q. The proportions are the same for
14 preordering?
15 A. [SEARS] That's correct, yes.
16 Q. And the two-and-a-half-times multiplier in
17 terms of the total forecast, does that apply to the
18 KPMG-generated orders as well?
19 A. [SEARS] Let me give you the preorder
20 numbers. We ran 7,918 preorder transactions on a
21 normal day. 7,601 were run on EDI, 317 were run on
22 the GUI.
23 Q. Thank you for tracking that down for us. I
24 appreciate it.

Page 5086

1 There was an item with respect to the
2 preorder interface that you wanted to track down.
3 Have you done that, or should we come back to that
4 later?
5 A. [SEARS] Yes, we've actually tracked that
6 down as well.
7 Q. I think the issue was whether in terms of
8 evaluating Verizon's reported performance metric for
9 preorder interface availability, KPMG reviewed not
10 only outages as reported by Verizon in its change-
11 control notices, but also outages as reported by
12 CLECs in trouble tickets.
13 A. [FOSTER] Verizon calculated the PO 2
14 metric, the OSS interface availability, using both
15 the EnView log files and the CLEC call log files.
16 Q. And did KPMG review the CLEC reports of
17 outages in order to verify that Verizon's
18 calculations were correct month by month?
19 A. [FOSTER] Yes. We were able to validate --
20 originally there was a not-satisfied related to the
21 calculation from the EnView log files. Upon
22 recalculation, we were able to validate the metrics.
23 That's referred to in PMR-1-1-7. We were able to
24 validate -- the short answer.

Page 5087

1 Q. But in your longer answer, you were
2 referring to PMR-1-1-7, and the comments on Page 646
3 of the report flag the issue about whether the
4 denominator was right in terms of the number of
5 boxes. I had thought that we were discussing a
6 different issue, that related to PMR-1-1-8, in terms
7 of the actual availability of the preorder
8 interface. With respect to that second test
9 cross-reference, did KPMG review the CLEC reports of
10 outages on the interface?
11 WITNESS SEARS: Can you read that
12 question back, please.
13 (Question read.)
14 A. [FOSTER] The answer to that question is
15 yes.
16 Q. Am I correct in understanding that the
17 metrics validation was done for metrics reported for
18 December of 1999, January of 2000, and February of
19 2000?
20 A. [FOSTER] That's correct -- initially. Upon
21 retest, it included March of 2000 and July of 2000.
22 Q. But not April, May, or June?
23 A. [FOSTER] No.
24 Q. Let's turn away from the questions that were

Page 5088

1 left open at the end of yesterday. I've got a brief
2 followup on a topic that you discussed yesterday
3 with, I believe, Ms. Johnson for WorldCom. This
4 relates to the question of commercial flow-through
5 results and the discussion on Page 122 of the
6 report.
7 First, I just want to make sure we're
8 all on the same page with respect to nomenclature,
9 because I think it gets a little confusing. KPMG
10 performed two different kinds of flow-through
11 analysis, one which it called achieved flow-through,
12 and one which it called commercial flow-through?
13 A. [SEARS] That's correct.
14 Q. And achieved flow-through had to do with the
15 flow-through that was achieved on KPMG-submitted
16 transactions?
17 A. [SEARS] Achieved flow-through --
18 Can you repeat that? I want to make
19 sure I gave you the right answer.
20 Q. Achieved flow-through, using the phrase in
21 the context of the achieved flow-through part of the
22 test, relates to flow-through on KPMG-submitted
23 orders?
24 A. [SEARS] It does, but I don't want to be